

REMARKS

In the outstanding office action, claims 1-14 were presented for examination. Claims 1-14 were restricted as follows: group I (claims 1-6); group II (claim 8-10); and group III (claims 11-14). Applicant presumes that claim 7, which depends from claim 6 is to be included in group I. Applicant also notes that claim 13 depends from claim 1 and thus is presumably included in group I. In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant elects with traverse group II, which corresponds to claims 8-10. In addition, Applicant submits herewith new claims 15-26, which are intended to read of the subject matter of the elected group namely, group II.

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement. There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and (2) there must be a serious burden on the examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that searching the subject matter of group II, and the subject matter groups I and III, as outlined in the outstanding office action, does not place a serious burden on the Examiner. Thus, applicant requests withdrawal of the requirement for restriction with regard to groups I and III.

Moreover, it is submitted that issuing one patent on the subject matter of groups I-III as defined in the outstanding office action would be more expedient for the

United States Patent and Trademark Office, the inventor and the public. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Requirement for Restriction.

Applicant has also amended claim 8, line 2 to delete the terms “substantially cylindrical porous”. Thus, no narrowing amendments have been made to claim 8. In addition, applicant further submits that the restriction requirement with regard to claims 11, 12 and 14 is now improper in view of the amendments to claim 8.

Claim 9 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error wherein the term “heater” has been amended to --element--. The amendments to claim 9 have merely made explicit what was implicit in the claim and thus, no narrowing amendments have been made to claim 9.

Claim 10 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error wherein the term “element” has been added to line 1. The amendments to claim 10 have merely made explicit what was implicit in the claim and thus, no narrowing amendments have been made to claim 10.

Claim 14 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error wherein the term “mechanism” has been amended to --apparatus--. The amendments to claim 14 have merely made explicit what was implicit in the claim and thus, no narrowing amendments have been made to claim 14.


If however, the restriction requirement is maintained applicant requests and authorizes the canceling of claims 1-7 and 11-14, corresponding to groups I and III, in order to avoid additional claim fees as the present amendment adds new claims 15-26.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicant's attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, he is invited to call the telephone number below for an interview.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Christopher C. Boehm
Reg. No. 41,624

Date: November 24, 2003
Telephone No. 248-524-2300
Customer No. 000128